In Defense of the Holy See against the post-conciliar usurpers

1. On the Supreme Primacy and the Infallible Teaching Authority of the Roman Pontiff

It is true that lay Catholics have no proper authority, as of themselves, to teach, but they can and they must be involved in the good Christian combat, by being, as His Holiness states here below, “living echoes of their masters in the faith”. Therefore, it is crucial to bring full references (i.e. full names, titles, pages, year, proper quotations, etc.) from the Magisterium when discussing on these religious matters.

“No one, however, must entertain the notion that private individuals are prevented from taking some active part in this duty of teaching, especially those on whom God has bestowed gifts of mind with the strong wish of rendering themselves useful. These, so often as circumstances demand, may take upon themselves, not, indeed, the office of the pastor, but the task of communicating to others what they have themselves received, becoming, as it were, living echoes of their masters in the faith. Such co-operation on the part of the laity has seemed to the Fathers of the Vatican Council so opportune and fruitful of good that they thought well to invite it. "All faithful Christians, but those chiefly who are in a prominent position, or engaged in teaching, we entreat, by the compassion of Jesus Christ, and enjoin by the authority of the same God and Saviour, that they bring aid to ward off and eliminate these errors from holy Church, and contribute their zealous help in spreading abroad the light of undefiled faith."(‘Constitution Dei Filius’, at end.) Let each one, therefore, bear in mind that he both can and should, so far as may be, preach the Catholic faith by the authority of his example, and by open and constant profession of the obligations it imposes. In respect, consequently, to the duties that bind us to God and the Church, it should be borne earnestly in mind that in propagating Christian truth and warding off errors the zeal of the laity should, as far as possible, be brought actively into play.” (H.H. Pope Leo XIII, “SAPIENTIAE CHRISTIANAE”, 10 January 1890)

When lay Catholics make pronouncements against the post-conciliar imposters posing as “Popes of the Catholic Church”, they are not concluding the case, since this privilege belongs solely to the Holy See, - (“Roma locuta est, causa finita est.- Rome has spoken and the cause is ended.” (Pope Saint Innocent I) -, and one day the

Holy See will publicly condemn these illegitimate occupants of today's Vatican and dioceses: these lay Catholics fight to eliminating the errors in order to protect the Church, according to their duty, and as Holy See asks them to do.

Moreover, when lay Catholics say that the post antipopes are not true Popes of the Catholic Church, they are not making a case, since the Church as already spoken about the God given rights of the Holy See. The Church has spoken and the case is ended. Inside and outside the ecumenical Councils, through the acts of Holy Tradition, including the unanimous consensus of her Fathers and Doctors, confirmed by Holy Scripture itself, Church's Holy Magisterium has already taught that the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of JESUS-CHRIST on earth, has supreme Primacy over the whole Catholic Church, which means that nobody can judge his decisions, and in this supreme Primacy resides his doctrinal infallibility, wether in an extraordinary form (i.e. in ecumenical Councils) or in an ordinary form, i.e. on a daily basis. So, when lay Catholics declare, not as a final judgement, which belongs to the proper hierarchy of the Church, as stated above, that these post-conciliar apostates, masked as "Popes", are in fact wolves in sheep's clothing, they just defend what Holy Mother Church has already decided, based on Holy Script and Catholic Tradition, that the Roman Pontiff has supreme Primacy over the whole Catholic Church, over all cardinals, bishops, priests and lay Catholics (i.e. nobody can judge the Roman Pontiff, much less to dare to deposing him, which would be not only sacrilegious and blasphemous but thoroughly null), and that the Roman Pontiff cannot err in his Magisterium (teaching), be it solemnly (extraordinarily) or daily (ordinarily), be it to the whole Church or to a part of it, be it on faith and morals or on the general discipline and good government of the Catholic Church.

"For none can doubt, and it is known to all ages, that the holy and Blessed Peter, the Prince and chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, and lives, presides, and judges to this day, always in his successors the Bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was founded by Him and consecrated by His Blood... WHEREFORE, resting on plain testimonies of the Sacred Writings, and adhering to the plain and express decrees both of Our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs, and of the General Councils, We renew the definition of the Ecumenical Council of Florence, by which all the faithful of CHRIST must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possesses the primacy over the whole world; and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and is true Vicar of CHRIST, and Head of the whole Church, and Father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him in Blessed Peter, by JESUS CHRIST our Lord, to rule, feed and govern

the universal Church : as is also contained in the Acts of the ecumenical Councils and in the Sacred Canons.

“Hence We teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all, of whatsoever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world ; so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme Pastor, through the preservation of unity, both of communion and of profession of the same faith, with the Roman Pontiff. This Is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.

“And since, by the divine right of apostolic primacy, one Roman Pontiff is placed over the universal Church, We further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, (From a Brief of Pius VI, “Super soliditate”, of November 28, 1786) and that in all causes the decision of which belongs to the Church recourse may be had to his tribunal (From the Acts of the Fourteenth General Council (Second of Lyons), A.D. 1274. Labbe's Councils, vol. IV, p. 512.), but that none may reopen the judgement of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgement (From Letter VIII of Pope Nicholas I, A.D. 858, to the Emperor Michael, in Labbe's Councils, vol. IX, pp. 1339 and 1570). Wherefore they err from the right path of truth who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgements of the Roman Pontiffs to an Ecumenical Council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff.

“If then any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those things which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not the fullness of this supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the Churches and over each and all the pastors of the faithful; let him be anathema.

“Moreover, that by the very apostolic primacy which the Roman Pontiff as the successor of Peter, the chief of the Apostles, holds over the universal Church, the supreme power of the Magisterium is also comprehended, this Holy See has always

held, the whole experience of the Church approves, and the ecumenical Councils themselves, especially those in which the East convened with the West in a union of faith and charity, have declared. For the fathers of the fourth council of Constantinople, adhering to the ways of the former ones, published this solemn profession: "Our first salvation is to guard the rule of right faith [...]. And since the sentiment of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed over when He says: 'Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church' [Matt. 16:18], these words which were spoken are proven true by actual results, since in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved untainted, and holy doctrine celebrated. Desiring, then, least of all to be separated from the faith and teaching of this [Apostolic See], We hope that We may deserve to be in the one communion which the Apostolic See proclaims, in which the solidarity of the Christian religion is whole and true" (Hrd V 778 f.) [cf. n. 171 f.]. Moreover, with the approval of the second council of Lyons, the Greeks have professed, "that the Holy Roman Church holds the highest and the full primacy and pre-eminence over the universal Catholic Church, which it truthfully and humbly professes it has received with plenitude of power from the Lord Himself in blessed Peter, the chief or head of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor; and, just as it is bound above others to defend the truth of faith, so, too, if any questions arise about faith, they should be defined by its judgment" [cf. n. 466]. Finally, the Council of Florence has defined: "That the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ and head of the whole Church and the father and teacher of all Christians; and to it in the blessed Peter has been handed down by the Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and guiding the universal Church".

“To satisfy this pastoral duty, our predecessors always gave tireless attention that the saving doctrine of Christ be spread among all the peoples of the earth, and with equal care they watched that, wherever it was received, it was preserved sound and pure. Therefore, the bishops of the whole world, now individually, now gathered in Synods, following a long custom of the churches and the formula of the ancient rule, referred to this Holy See those dangers particularly which emerged in the affairs of faith, that there especially the damages to faith might be repaired where faith cannot experience a failure (Cf. Saint Bernard, "Letter (190) to Innocent II" [ML 182, 1053 D]). The Roman Pontiffs, moreover, according as the condition of the times and affairs advised, sometimes by calling ecumenical Councils or by examining the opinion of the Church spread throughout the world; sometimes by particular synods, sometimes by employing other helps which divine Providence supplied, have defined that those matters must be held which with God's help they have recognized as in agreement with Sacred Scripture and apostolic tradition. For, the Holy Ghost was not promised to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might

disclose new doctrine, but that by His help they might guard sacredly the revelation transmitted through the apostles and the deposit of faith, and might faithfully set it forth. Indeed, all the venerable fathers have embraced their apostolic doctrine, and the holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed it, knowing full well that the See of St. Peter always remains unimpaired by any error, according to the divine promise of our Lord the Savior made to the chief of His disciples: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren" [Luke 22:32].” (Ecumenical Vatican Council, "Dogmatic Constitution I on the Church of Christ", Chapter 2. "The Perpetuity of the Primacy of Blessed Peter among the Roman Pontiffs", Session IV, July 18, 1870, Denzinger 1832-1837, pp. 455-456.)

“Now, this is precisely what the Vatican Council calls the ordinary and universal Magisterium ; and this ordinary and universal Magisterium is one of the ways in which the Church explicitly proposes the truths of the Catholic faith; it is a mode of teaching which the Pope and the dispersed bishops use to propose the revealed dogmas, and differ from the solemn definitions of the ecumenical councils only in mode and form; it is ordinary, that is to say, of every moment, and universal, that is to say, it is exercised in the whole Church, instead of extraordinarily and in a given place, as in the Councils.” (Chanoine Georges Bareille, “Le Catéchisme Romain”, 1906, Volume II, Le dogme, pp. 604-605).

“Nor can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, contend that 'without sin and without any sacrifice of the Catholic profession assent and obedience may be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See, whose object is declared to concern the Church’s general good and her rights and discipline, so only it does not touch the dogmata of faith and morals.' But no one can be found not clearly and distinctly to see and understand how grievously this is opposed to the Catholic dogma of the full power given from God by Christ our Lord Himself to the Roman Pontiff of feeding, ruling and guiding the Universal Church.” (HH Pope Pius IX, “Quanta Cura”, 1864)

Canon 1322

§ 1. Our Lord JESUS-CHRIST has entrusted to the Church the Deposit of the Faith, that she may religiously preserve the revealed Doctrine and faithfully expound it with the continual assistance of the Holy Ghost.

“But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.” (saint Luke 22:32)

“For thee, because I destine thee to be the head and chief of the Apostles and of My Church, that thy faith fail not in believing Me to be the Christ and the Saviour of the world. Observe that Christ in this prayer asked and obtained for Peter two especial privileges before the other Apostles : the first was personal, that he should never fall from faith in Christ ; for Christ looked back to the sifting in the former verse, that is the temptation of His own apprehension when the other Apostles flew off from Him like chaff and lost their faith, and were dispersed, and fled into all parts. But Peter, [though he was not yet Pope] although he denied Christ with his lips, at the hour foretold, and lost his love for Him, yet retained his faith. So S. Chrysostom ("Hom. xxxviii.") on S. Matthew ; S. Augustine ("de corrept. et Grat. chap. viii.") ; Theophylact and others. ... Another and a certain privilege was common to Peter with all his successors, that he and all the other bishops of Rome (for Peter, as Christ willed, founded and confirmed the Pontifical Church at Rome), should never openly fall from this faith, so as to teach the Church heresy, or any error, contrary to the faith. So S. Leo ("serm. xxii."), on Natalis of SS. Peter and Paul ; S. Cyprian (Lib. i. ep. 3), to Cornelius; Lucius I., Felix I., Agatho, Nicolas I., Leo IX., Innocent III., Bernard and others, whom Bellarmine cites and follows ("Lib. i. de Pontif. Roman").

“For it was necessary that Christ, by His most wise providence, should provide for His Church, which is ever being sifted and tempted by the devil, and that not only in the time of Peter, but at all times henceforth, even to the end of the world, an oracle of the true faith which she might consult in every doubt, and by which she might be taught and confirmed in the faith, otherwise the Church might err in faith, "quod absit !" For she is, as S. Paul said to Timothy, " the pillar and ground of the truth" (I Tim. iii. 15). This oracle of the Church then is Peter, and all successive bishops of Rome. This promise made to Peter and his successors, most especially applies to the time when Peter, as the successor of Christ, began to be the head of the Church, that is, after the death of Christ.”(Mossman, "The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide", 1908, vol. 4, pp. 482-483)

“Chap. 7 ... The Holy Church built upon a rock, that is Christ, and upon Peter or Cephas, the son of John who first was called Simon, because by the gates of Hell, that is, by the disputations of heretics which lead the vain to destruction, it would never be overcome; thus Truth itself promises, through whom are true, whatsoever things are true: "The gates of hell will not prevail against it" [Matt. 16: 18]. The same Son declares that He obtained the effect of this promise from the Father by prayers, by saying to Peter: "Simon, behold satan etc." [Luke 23:31]. Therefore, will there be anyone so foolish as to dare to regard His prayer as in anyway vain whose being willing is being able? By the See of the chief of the Apostles, namely by the Roman Church, through the same Peter, as well as through his successors, have not

the comments of all the heretics been disapproved, rejected, and overcome, and the hearts of the brethren in the faith of Peter which so far neither has failed, nor up to the end will fail, been strengthened? » (Pope saint Leo IX, from the epistle "In terra pax hominibus" to Michael Cerularius and to Leo of Achrida, September 2, 1053; Denz. 351)

In view of some false and restrictive interpretations of the Dogma of Infallibility, Monsignor d'Avanzo, the reporter of the Faith Delegation of the Vatican Council I was keen to point out:

“The Church is infallible in her ordinary Magisterium, which is exercised DAILY mainly by the Pope, and by the bishops united to him, who for this reason are infallible, of the infallibility of the Church, which is assisted by the HOLY GHOST, EVERY DAY.” (Mansi, 52, 1193).

“JESUS CHRIST instituted in the Church a living, authentic and, moreover, perpetual Magisterium [...], and He has willed and very strictly ordered that the doctrinal teachings of this doctrinal teachings of this Magisterium were to be received as His own... [If the teaching of the Church] could in any way be false, it would follow, which is obviously absurd, that God Himself would be the author of man's error.” (H. H. Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical “Satis cognitum”, June 29, 1896).

“When this Spirit of Truth has come, He will teach you all truth." [John XVI, 12]. This truth He grants and gives it to the Church, and, by His CONTINUAL presence, He sees that the Church never succumbs to error.” (H. H. Leo XIII, Encyclical “Divinum illud”, 9 May 1897).

“For the teaching authority of the Church, which in the divine wisdom was constituted on earth in order that revealed doctrines might remain intact for ever, and that they might be brought with ease and security to the knowledge of men, and which is DAILY exercised through the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops who are in communion with him, has also the office of defining, when it sees fit, any truth with solemn rites and decrees, whenever this is necessary either to oppose the errors or the attacks of heretics, or more clearly and in greater detail to stamp the minds of the faithful with the articles of sacred doctrine which have been explained. But in the use of this extraordinary teaching authority no newly invented matter is brought in, nor is anything new added to the number of those truths which are at least implicitly contained in the deposit of Revelation, divinely handed down to the Church: only those which are made clear which perhaps may still seem obscure to some, or that which some have previously called into question is declared to be of faith.

“This Church, after being so wonderfully instituted, could not, on the removal by death of its Founder and of the Apostles who were the pioneers in propagating it, be entirely extinguished and cease to be, for to it was given the commandment to lead all men, without distinction of time or place, to eternal salvation: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations." In the CONTINUAL carrying out of this task, will any element of strength and efficiency be wanting to the Church, when Christ Himself is PERPETUALLY present to it, according to His solemn promise: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world?" It follows then that the Church of Christ not only exists to-day and always, but is also exactly the same as it was in the time of the Apostles, unless we were to say, which God forbid, either that Christ our Lord could not effect His purpose, or that He erred when He asserted that the gates of hell should never prevail against it.

“Jesus Christ sent His Apostles into the whole world in order that they might permeate all nations with the Gospel faith, and, lest they should err, He willed beforehand that they should be taught by the Holy Ghost: Has then this doctrine of the Apostles completely vanished away, or sometimes been obscured, in the Church, whose ruler and defense is God Himself? If our Redeemer plainly said that His Gospel was to continue not only during the times of the Apostles, but also till future ages, is it possible that the object of faith should in the process of time become so obscure and uncertain, that it would be necessary to-day to tolerate opinions which are even incompatible one with another? If this were true, we should have to confess that the coming of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, and the perpetual indwelling of the same Spirit in the Church, and the very preaching of Jesus Christ, have several centuries ago, lost all their efficacy and use, to affirm which would be blasphemy. But the Only-begotten Son of God, when He commanded His representatives to teach all nations, obliged all men to give credence to whatever was made known to them by "witnesses preordained by God," and also confirmed His command with this sanction: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." These two commands of Christ, which must be fulfilled, the one, namely, to teach, and the other to believe, cannot even be understood, unless the Church proposes a complete and easily understood teaching, and is IMMUNE when it thus teaches from ALL DANGER OF ERRING.” (H.H. Pope Pius XI, “Mortalium Animos”, 6 January 1928)

I conclude and summarize the above citations with a divine passage from Holy Scripture:

“And Jesus coming, spoke to them, saying: All power is given to me in heaven and

in earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you ALL DAYS, even to the consummation of the world." (saint Matthieu 28, 18-20)

If CHRIST then stays DAILY with His Church (with the teaching hierarchy of the Catholic Church), it is impossible that the Pope or this Catholic Church of JESUS-CHRIST Church could err in her DAILY public and official teachings. To affirm otherwise is to blaspheme against Our Lord JESUS-CHRIST.

1.1 Epikeia

Moreover, in the right interpretation of ecclesiastical laws, one has to take into account what happens in special cases, when in extraordinary circumstances the ordinary application of a particular law would case harm to the common good. In these cases, epikeia has to be applied.

The purpose of epikeia is well explained by St. Thomas:

"It was not possible to lay down rules of law that would apply to every single case. Legislators in framing laws attend to what commonly happens: although if the law be applied to certain cases it will frustrate the equality of justice and be injurious to the common good, which the law has in view. Thus the law requires deposits to be restored, because in the majority of cases this is just. Yet it happens sometimes to be injurious–for instance, if a madman were to put his sword in deposit, and demand its delivery while in a state of madness, or if a man were to seek the return of his deposit in order to fight against his country. On these and like cases it is bad to follow the law, and it is good to set aside the letter of the law and to follow the dictates of justice and the common good. This is the object of 'epikeia' which we call equity." ("Summa Theologica", 2^d of 2^d, 120,1.)

"Epikeia is an interpretation exempting one from the law contrary to the clear words of the law and in accordance with the mind of the legislator. It is evidently a very exception thing. It may be used with prudent discretion, and is justified, only in a particular case where: (a) the strict interpretation of the law would work great hardship; and (b) in view of the usual interpretation it may be prudently conjectured that, in this particular case, the legislator would not wish the law to be strictly applied." (Bouscaren and Ellis, "Canon Law, A Text and Commentary", 1957, p. 33)

Let us take an example.

Let us remember, for example, the case of saint Bernard, simple monk, who together with saint Norbert fought vigorously and publicly to unmask the false pope (antipope) Anaclet II, sitting illegitimately in Vatican. Saint Bernard wrote thus to the german emperor Lothar: “It is an insult to Christ that a man of Jewish origin “sit” on the throne of Peter.” (lettre 139, in: *Sancti Bernardi opera,* Rome 1974, 1. VII, p. 335 ou *Oeuvres complètes de St. Bernard,* Paris 1865 – 1867, 1. 1, p. 261) An antipope does not actually sit of the throne of Peter, but rather usurps it. Saint Bernard intervened also in the Council of Étampes (1130) against the antipope Anaclet II and in favor of the true Pope Innocent II, who was in exile, in France. Pushed by the holy influence of saint Bernard, the French King Luis VI as well supported Pope Innocent II and took action for his return to Rome. If saint Bernard had followed the ordinary ecclesiastical laws, being a simple monk, he would have minded his monk duties, since he was not part of the teaching Church. But he played his very important role, as a true soldier of JESUS-CHRIST, and by the grace of God, changed the course of events. It seems ironic but even today, a jewish antipope usurps the throne of Saint Peter, posing as a Pope. Trustful religious sources from Argentina confirm the Jorge Bergoglio, acting as “Pope Francis”, is actually a jew.

“There may exist the case of a minister who fell into heresy without being officially declared by the Church: it is then necessary to use a great circumspection. A minister of the Church, fallen into an error against the faith can only be officially discredited by his hierarchical superior, having jurisdiction over him. However, on the ground of purely scientific controversy, he can be attacked and convinced for his mistakes, always leaving the last word or the definitive sentence to the single infallible authority of the universal Master. The great rule, the only rule in these matters, we will gladly say it, it is the constant practice of the Church of God, following this saying of a holy Father: 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.' Well ! Here is how we always proceeded in the Church of God. When simple faithful noticed at an ecclesiastical doctrines in opposition to those commonly taught as exclusively good and true, they pushed against them the crying alarm in their books and brochures, they raised their voice thus claiming the decisive sentence from the infallible Magisterium of Rome. There are the barking of the dog which warn the shepherd. Barely if there has been a heresy in Catholicism that has not been unmasked and first discredited in this way.” (Don Félix Sarda y Salvany, "Le libéralisme est un péché", Paris, 1915, pp. 155-156; this book received also the approbation from the Sacred Congregation of Index, on January 10th, 1887)

“Public, notorious sinners may be spoken of freely, provided always even then that a

spirit of charity and compassion prevail, and that you do not speak of them with arrogance or presumption, or as though you took pleasure in the fall of others. To do this is the sure sign of a mean ungenerous mind. And, of course, you must speak freely in condemnation of the professed enemies of God and His Church, heretics and schismatics,—it is true charity to point out the wolf wheresoever he creeps in among the flock. Most people permit themselves absolute latitude in criticizing and censuring rulers, and in calumniating nationalities, according to their own opinions and likings. But do you avoid this fault; it is displeasing to God, and is liable to lead you into disputes and quarrels. When you hear evil of any one, cast any doubt you fairly can upon the accusation; or if that is impossible, make any available excuse for the culprit; and where even that may not be, be yet pitiful and compassionate, and remind those with whom you are speaking that such as stand upright do so solely through God's Grace. Do your best kindly to check the scandal-bearer, and if you know anything favorable to the person criticized, take pains to mention it." (Saint Francis de Sales, "Introduction to the devout life", 3^{d} part, chap. 29)

2. On the Roman Pontiff and saint Bellarmin

"Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: "He who heareth you, heareth Me"; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine. <u>But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians</u>.

"It is also true that theologians must always return to the sources of divine revelation: for it belongs to them to point out how the doctrine of the living Teaching Authority is to be found either explicitly or implicitly in the Scriptures and in Tradition. Besides, each source of divinely revealed doctrine contains so many rich treasures of truth, that they can really never be exhausted. Hence it is that theology through the study of its sacred sources remains ever fresh; on the other hand, speculation which neglects a deeper search into the deposit of faith, proves sterile, as we know from experience. But for this reason even positive theology cannot be on a par with merely historical science. For, together with the sources of positive theology God has given to His Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and

explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, not even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church. But if the Church does exercise this function of teaching, as she often has through the centuries, either in the ordinary or in the extraordinary way, it is clear how false is a procedure which would attempt to explain what is clear by means of what is obscure. Indeed, the very opposite procedure must be used. Hence Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, teaching that the most noble office of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation, added these words, and with very good reason: 'in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church.'"(H.H. Pope Pius XII, "Humani generis", 12 August 1950)

According to Catholic authors, there are three ways a Pope losses his office : by demission, by perpetual insanity and by formal heresy. (Rev. R. Naz, "Traité de droit canonique", 1946, vol 1, page 366). The third case could be possible theoretically, if the Pope acted as a private doctor. If this is the case, since the Holy See is judged by nobody (Canon 1556), we would conclude that by the act itself, "ipso facto", and without any other declaration, the Pope would loose its Papacy automatically. In history, a Pope, even as a private doctor, never fell into formal heresy. (Rev. R. Naz, "Idem", page 367; Prümmer, op. cit., p. 128; Vermeersch et Creusen, op. cit., T. 1, page 125)

According to saint Alphonsus-MARIA de Liguori, if a Pope would be notoriously and obstinately heretic then he would cease to be Pope and the throne would be vacant. In addition, saint Liguori cites saint Bellarmin saying that God would never permit a Pope to be heretic, neither publicly, nor hiddenly ("De Rom. Pont." t. 4, c. 6). (Saint A.M. Liguori, "De l'Autorité du Souverain Pontife", "Oeuvres Dogmatiques", Tome 17 bis, page 11)

"There are two cases where saint Liguori teaches that cardinals and bishops may convene a council. The first is when a Pope is doubtful, as it happened during the Western Schism; the second is when a Pope would fall obstinately and notoriously into heresy. This hypothesis is chimerical without doubt. In the first case, each of the doubtful Popes is obliged to obey to the decrees of the council because the Holy See is regarded as vacant. ("Les oeuvres dogmatique", t. 2, page 165) In the second case, the Pope would loose the Pontificate automatically, "ipso facto", because he would be out of the Church and, as a result, he could not be her head, which the council would [eventually] declare ("Les oeuvres dogmatiques", t. 9, page 232)." (Rev.

Berthier,"Abrégé de théologie...", 5e édition, page 47)

One must not forget as well that all the works of saint Liguori ("moralium, asceticorum et dogmaticorum") have been approved by the Holy See after a careful and serious examination by the Holy Congregation of Rites and confirmed by His Holiness, Pope Pius VII, on May 18th, 1803.

As I mentioned above, according to the biblical comments of Rev. Father Cornelius a Lapide S.J., "...Another and a certain privilege was common to Peter with all his successors, that he and all the other bishops of Rome (for Peter, as Christ willed, founded and confirmed the Pontifical Church at Rome), should never openly fall from this faith, so as to teach the Church heresy, or any error, contrary to the faith. So S. Leo ("serm. xxii."), on Natalis of SS. Peter and Paul ; S. Cyprian (Lib. i. ep. 3), to Cornelius; Lucius I., Felix I., Agatho, Nicolas I., Leo IX., Innocent III., Bernard and others, whom Bellarmine cites and follows ("Lib. i. de Pontif. Roman")."

Let us then summarize, from the references I brought forth in this second part:

CHRIST Our Lord did not entrust the authentic interpretation of the Divine Revelation to theologians, much less to the laity, but to the teaching Church ALONE (i.e. to the Roman Pontiff and to the Bishops in union with him). As I mentioned in the first part, it is true that laymen, as such, are not entitled to teach with authority, but they are not only allowed but even much more encouraged by the Holy See and the Church to be "the voice of the Magisterium", (cf. The Encyclical "SAPIENTIAE CHRISTIANAE" from H.H. Pope Leo XIII), an office which I try to carry out, with the help of Our Lord and Our Lady, like other soldiers of JESUS CHRIST in the Catholic Church. And the holy Magisterium teaches us that the Roman Pontiff has supreme Primacy over the whole Catholic Church and he can never teach any doctrinal error, in his official duty as Vicar of JESUS CHRIST.

Saint Bellarmin, doctor of Church, never taught anything against this Magisterium, I mean anything against faith and morals, otherwise he could have not been canonized, much less elevated to the rank of a doctor in the Catholic Church. In his works, especially in the controversies on the Roman Pontiff, he analyzes different theological opinions, some of them merely theoretically, but he himself taught and he believed that God would never allow that the Roman Pontiff fell into heresy, neither privately nor hiddenly, which saint Alphonsus also testifies ("De Rom. Pont." t. 4, c. 6). On the other hand, Catholics have a duty to listen primarily to the teaching

Church (Pope and bishops united to him), before the doctors or theologians:

“46 Q. Are we obliged to hear the Teaching Church?

“A. Yes, without doubt we are obliged under pain of eternal damnation to hear the Teaching Church; for Jesus Christ has said to the Pastors of His Church, in the persons of the Apostles: "He who hears you, hears Me, and he who despises you, despises Me.” (Catechism of saint Pius X)

And when the Church teaches by a final decision, all controversies are over, according to the saying of Pope saint Innocent I : “Roma locuta est, causa finita est.” The Church has taught by a final decision on the matter of the Roman Pontiff, that he has supreme primacy over the whole Church, and that he cannot err doctrinally in his public office as Vicar of JESUS-CHRIST, be it ordinarily (i.e. daily) or extraordinarily, such as in the councils. Since the Pope has supreme Primacy, nobody has authority over him (canon 1556), so nobody can depose him. Theoretically speaking, as a chimerical hypothesis, as saint Alphonsus would say, i.e. it can never happen, if a Pope would fall into heresy as a private doctor, he would loose office ipso facto, by the act itself, which a council or a future Pope would later declare.

Here below you can read an extract **(lib. II, cap. 30)** from the work of saint Bellarmin on the Roman Pontiff. The saint agrees with the fifth opinion, which says that if the Pope would fall into heresy, he would loose the Papacy automatically, since he could not be the head of a body of which he is not a member. And only in this capacity, as a heretic outside of the Church, he could be eventually judged and condemned by a Council, or a future Pope:

The fourth opinion is that of Cajetan, for whom *(de auctor. papae et con., cap. 20 et 21)* the manifestly heretical Pope is not *“ipso facto”* deposed, but can and must be deposed by the Church. To my judgment, **this opinion cannot be defended.** For, in the first place, it is proven with arguments from authority and from reason that the manifest heretic is “ipso facto” deposed. The argument from authority is based on St. Paul (Titus, c. 3), who orders that the heretic be avoided after two warnings, that is, after showing himself to be manifestly obstinate - which means before any excommunication or judicial sentence. And this is what St. Jerome writes, adding that the other sinners are excluded from the Church by sentence of excommunication, but the heretics exile themselves and separate themselves by their own act from the body of Christ. Now, a Pope who remains Pope cannot be avoided, for how could we be required to avoid our own head? How can we separate

ourselves from a member united to us?

This principle is **most certain.** The non-Christian cannot in any way be Pope, as Cajetan himself admits (ib. c. 26). The reason for this is that he cannot be head of what he is not a member; now he who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church, and a manifest heretic is not a Christian, as is clearly taught by St. Cyprian *(lib. 4, epist. 2),* St. Athanasius *(Scr. 2 cont. Arian.),* St. Augustine *(lib. de great. Christ. cap.* 20), St. Jerome *(contra Lucifer.)* and others; therefore the manifest heretic cannot be Pope.

To this Cajetan responds (in *Apol. pro tract. praedicto cap.* 25 *et in ipso tract. cap.* 22) that the heretic is not a Christian *"simpliciter"* [i.e. without qualification, or absolutely], but is one *"secundum quid"* [i.e. in a qualified or relative sense]. For, granted that two things constitute the Christian — the faith and the [baptismal] character — the heretic, having lost the faith, is still in some way united to the Church and is capable of jurisdiction; therefore, he is also Pope, but ought to be removed, since he is disposed, with ultimate disposition, to cease to be Pope: as the man who is still not dead but is *"in extremis"* [at the point of death].

Against this: in the first place, if the heretic remained, *"in actu"* [actually], united to the Church in virtue of the character, he would never be able to be cut or separated from her *"in actu,"* for the character is indelible. But there is no one who denies that some people may be separated "in actu" from the Church. Therefore, the character does not make the heretic be *"in actu"* in the Church, but is only a sign that he was in the Church and that he must return to her. Analogously, when a sheep wanders lost in the mountains, the mark impressed on it does not make it be in the fold, but indicates from which fold it had fled and to which fold it ought to be brought back. This truth has a confirmation in St. Thomas who says *(Summ. Theol.* III, q. 8, a. 3) that those who do not have the faith are not united *"in actu"* to Christ, but only potentially — and St. Thomas here refers to the internal union, and not to the external which is produced by the confession of faith and visible signs. Therefore, as the character is something internal, and not external, according to St. Thomas the character alone does not unite a man, *"in actu,"* to Christ.

Further against the argument of Cajetan: either faith is a disposition necessary *"simpliciter"* for someone to be Pope, or it is only necessary for someone to be a **good** Pope ["ad bene esse," to exist well, to be good, as opposed to simply existing]. In the first hypothesis, in case this disposition be eliminated by the contrary disposition, which is heresy, the Pope immediately ceases to be Pope: for the form cannot maintain itself without the necessary dispositions. In the second hypothesis, the Pope cannot be deposed by reason of heresy, for otherwise he would also have to

be deposed for ignorance, immorality, and other similar causes, which impede the knowledge, the morality, and the other dispositions necessary for him to be a **good** Pope *("ad bene esse papae").* In addition to this, Cajetan recognises *(tract. praed.,* ca. 26) that the Pope cannot be deposed for the lack of dispositions necessary, not *"simpliciter,"* but only *"ad bene esse."*

To this, Cajetan responds that faith is a disposition necessary *"simpliciter,"* but partial, and not total; and that, therefore, even if his faith disappears he can still continue being Pope, by reason of the other part of the disposition, the character, which still endures.

Against this argument: either the total disposition, constituted by the character and by faith, is necessary *"simpliciter,"* or it is not, the partial disposition then being sufficient. In the first hypothesis, the faith disappearing there no longer remains the disposition *"simpliciter"* necessary, for the disposition *"simpliciter"* necessary was the total, and the total no longer exists. In the second hypothesis, the faith is only necessary *"ad bene esse,"* and therefore its absence does not justify the deposition of the Pope. In addition to this, what finds itself in the ultimate disposition to death, immediately thereafter ceases to exist, without the intervention of any other external force, as is obvious; therefore, also the Pope heretic ceases to be Pope by himself, without any deposition.

Finally, the Holy Fathers teach unanimously not only that heretics are outside of the Church, but also that they are *"ipso facto"* deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and dignity. St. Cyprian *(lib. 2, epist. 6)* says: "We affirm that absolutely no heretic or schismatic has any power or right"; and he also teaches *(lib. 2, epist. 1)* that the heretics who return to the Church must be received as laymen, even though they have been formerly priests or bishops in the Church. St. Optatus *(lib. 1 cont. Parmen.)* teaches that heretics and schismatics cannot have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, nor bind nor loose. St. Ambrose *(lib. 1 de poenit., ca. 2),* St. Augustine (in *Enchir.,* cap 65), St. Jerome *(lib. cont. Lucifer.)* teach the same.

Pope St. Celestine I *(epist. ad Jo. Antioch.,* which appears in *Conc. Ephes., tom.* I, cap. 19) wrote: "It is evident that he [who has been excommunicated by Nestorius] has remained and remains in communion with us, and that we do not consider destituted [i.e. deprived of office, by judgment of Nestorius], anyone who has been excommunicated or deprived of his charge, either episcopal or clerical, by Bishop Nestorius or by the others who followed him, after they commenced preaching heresy. For he who had already shown himself as deserving to be excommunicated, could not excommunicate anyone by his sentence."

And in a letter to the clergy of Constantinople, Pope St. Celestine I says: “The authority of Our Apostolic See has determined that the bishop, cleric, or simple Christian who had been deposed or excommunicated by Nestorius or his followers, after the latter began to preach heresy shall not be considered deposed or excommunicated. For he who had defected from the faith with such preachings, cannot depose or remove anyone whatsoever.”

St. Nicholas I *(epist. ad Michael)* repeats and confirms the same. Finally, St. Thomas also teaches *(S. Theol.,* II-II, q. 39, a. 3) that schismatics immediately lose all jurisdiction, and that anything they try to do on the basis of any jurisdiction will be null.

There is no basis for that which some respond to this: that these Fathers based themselves on ancient law, while nowadays, by decree of the Council of Constance, they alone lose their jurisdiction who are excommunicated by name or who assault clerics. This argument, I say, has no value at all, for those Fathers, in affirming that heretics lose jurisdiction, did not cite any human law, which furthermore perhaps did not exist in relation to the matter, but argued on the basis of the very nature of heresy. The Council of Constance only deals with the excommunicated, that is, those who have lost jurisdiction by sentence of the Church, while heretics already before being excommunicated are outside the Church and deprived of all jurisdiction. For they have already been condemned by their own sentence, as the Apostle teaches (Tit. 3:10-11), that is, they have been cut off from the body of the Church without excommunication, as St. Jerome affirms.

Besides that, the second affirmation of Cajetan, that the Pope heretic can be truly and authoritatively deposed by the Church, is no less false than the first. For if the Church deposes the Pope against his will it is certainly above the Pope; however, Cajetan himself defends, in the same treatise, the contrary of this. Cajetan responds that the Church, in deposing the Pope, does not have authority over the Pope, but only over the link that unites the person to the pontificate. In the same way that the Church in uniting the pontificate to such a person, is not, because of this, above the Pontiff, so also the Church can separate the pontificate from such a person in case of heresy, without saying that it is above the Pope.

But contrary to this it must be observed in the first place that, from the fact that the Pope deposes bishops, it is deduced that the Pope is above all the bishops, though the Pope on deposing a bishop does not destroy the episcopal jurisdiction, but only separates it from that person. In the second place, to depose anyone from the pontificate against the will of the deposed, is without doubt punishing him; however, to punish is proper to a superior or to a judge. In the third place, given that according

to Cajetan and the other Thomists, in reality the whole and the parts taken as a whole are the same thing, he who has authority over the parts taken as a whole, being able to separate them one from another, has also authority over the whole itself which is constituted by those parts.

The example of the electors, who have the power to designate a certain person for the pontificate, without however having power over the Pope, given by Cajetan, is also destitute of value. For when something is being made, the action is exercised over the matter of the future thing, and not over the composite, which does not yet exist, but when a thing is destroyed, the action is exercised over the composite, as becomes patent on consideration of the things of nature. Therefore, on creating the Pontiff, the cardinals do not exercise their authority over the Pontiff for he does not yet exist, but over the matter, that is, over the person who by the election becomes disposed to receive the pontificate from God. But if they deposed the Pontiff, they would necessarily exercise authority over the composite, that is, over the person endowed with the pontifical power, that is, over the Pontiff.

Therefore, the true opinion is the fifth, according to which the Pope who is manifestly a heretic ceases by himself to be Pope and head, in the same way as he ceases to be a Christian and a member of the body of the Church; and for this reason he can be judged and punished by the Church. This is the opinion of all the ancient Fathers, who teach that manifest heretics immediately lose all jurisdiction, and outstandingly that of St. Cyprian *(lib. 4, epist. 2)* who speaks as follows of Novatian, who was Pope [i.e. antipope] in the schism which occurred during the pontificate of St. Cornelius: "He would not be able to retain the episcopate [i.e. of Rome], and, if he was made bishop before, he separated himself from the body of those who were, like him, bishops, and from the unity of the Church."

According to what St. Cyprian affirms in this passage, even had Novatian been the true and legitimate Pope, he would have automatically fallen from the pontificate, if he separated himself from the Church.

This is the opinion of great recent doctors, as John Driedo *(lib. 4 de Script. et dogmat. Eccles., cap. 2, par. 2, sent. 2),* who teaches that only they separate themselves from the Church who are expelled, like the excommunicated, and those who depart by themselves from her or oppose her, as heretics and schismatics. And in his seventh affirmation, he maintains that in those who turn away from the Church, there remains absolutely no spiritual power over those who are in the Church. Melchior Cano says the same *(lib. 4 de loc., cap. 2),* teaching that heretics are neither parts nor members of the Church, and that it cannot even be conceived that anyone could be head and Pope, without being member and part *(cap. ult. ad*

argument. 12). And he teaches in the same place, in plain words, that occult heretics are still of the Church, they are parts and members, and that therefore the Pope who is an occult heretic is still Pope. This is also the opinion of the other authors whom we cite in book I De Ecclesia.

The foundation of this argument is that the manifest heretic is not in any way a member of the Church, that is, neither spiritually nor corporally, which signifies that he is not such by internal union nor by external union. For even bad Catholics [i.e. who are **not** heretics] are united and are members, spiritually by faith, corporally by confession of faith and by participation in the visible sacraments; the occult heretics are united and are members although only by external union; on the contrary, the good catechumens belong to the Church only by an internal union, not by the external; but manifest heretics do not pertain in any manner, as we have already proved.

3. On the pseudo-council of 1962

I will start this part with a question for you?

On the 20th of October 1870, due to grave circumstances, such as the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war and the attack on Vatican by the Garibaldi's masonic troupes from the North, Pope Pius IX suspended the Vatican Council with his Bull "Postquam Dei Munere" and ordered, under the curse of God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, to resume and end the Council, which would be done by another Pope, at a proper time in the future. During his reign, Pope Pius XI, desired to resume the suspended Council, but his advisers dissuaded him to do so, due to the infiltration of the modernist clergy into the high ranks, which would constitute a great danger for the Council to be hijacked by them.

On 11th of October 1962, the freemason antipope John XXIII publicly announced the opening of the Second Vatican Council.

Is it possible for the Holy See to call a Second Vatican Council without ending the First Vatican Council, according to the directives of Pope Pius IX, proclaimed under pain of double malediction?

Moreover, according to the holy Catholic Tradition, a true ecumenical council is convoked only by a true Pope, and when his final decrees, part of the extraordinary

form of the holy Magisterium, are approved by the Pope, they are protected by the doctrinal infallibility, as promised by our Lord JESUS-CHRIST (cf. Vatican Council decrees here-above).

It is a fact that the decrees of the 2d pseudo-Vatican council, approved by freemason antipope Paul VI are heretical, and this is another proof that this pseudo-council is not part of the Catholic Church's holy Magisterium. And again, as I wrote earlier against the post-conciliar antipopes, the laity declares this truth with the rights given to him by Holy See (cf. The encyclical of Pope Leo XIII " Sapientae Christianae"), while praying and waiting for a future Pope or Council to officially confirm this truth in the future, through a final authoritarian decision.

3.1 Short summary of the major errors of Vartican II and its bitter fruits (taken from Mgr D. Sanborn)

There are four major errors: (1) concerning the unity of the Church; (2) concerning ecumenism; (3) concerning religious liberty; (4) concerning collegiality.

(1). Vatican II teaches heresy concerning the unity of the Church, namely that the Church of Christ is not exclusively identified with the Catholic Church, but merely subsists in it. This heretical doctrine is contained principally in "Lumen Gentium", and its heretical meaning is confirmed in statements of antipope Paul VI and his successors, particularly in the 1983 "Code of Canon Law", in the 1992 Statement concerning Church and Communion, and in the Ecumenical Directory.

This heretical doctrine is contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church, contained principally in "Satis Cognitum" of Pope Leo XIII, "Mortalium Animos" of Pope Pius XI, "Mystici Corporis" of Pope Pius XII, and in the condemnations of the "Branch Theory" made by the Holy Office under Pope Pius IX.

(2). The teaching of Vatican II concerning ecumenism, which states that non-Catholic religions are a means of salvation, is overtly heretical. This doctrine directly contradicts the teaching of the Church that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, called by Pope Pius IX a most well-known Catholic dogma. In addition, the ecumenical practices which have resulted from this heretical doctrine are directly contrary to "Mortalium Animos" of Pope Pius XI.

(3). The teaching of Vatican II on religious liberty, contained in "Dignitatis

Humanæ", nearly word for word asserts the very doctrine which was condemned by Pope Pius VII in "Post Tam Diuturnas", by Pope Gregory XVI in "Mirari Vos", by Pope Pius IX in "Quanta Cura", and by Pope Leo XIII in "Libertas Præstantissimum". The teaching of Vatican II on religious liberty also contradicts the royalty of Jesus Christ in society as expressed in "Quas Primas" of Pope Pius XI, and the constant attitude and practice of the Church with regard to civil society.

(4). The teaching of Vatican II concerning collegiality alters the monarchical constitution of the Catholic Church, with which she was endowed by the Divine Savior. The doctrine of Vatican II, confirmed by the "1983 Code of Canon Law", which states that the subject (the possessor) of the supreme authority of the Church is the college of bishops together with the Pope, is contrary to the defined doctrine of the Council of Florence and of Vatican I.

- What is wrong with the "New Mass", and the liturgical changes which have been promulgated since Vatican II?

- The liturgical changes of Vatican II reflect the doctrinal errors which I have just mentioned. The new liturgy is an ecumenical liturgy, and seeks to erase any doctrines which are distinctly Catholic, and to turn the Catholic liturgy into a form of worship which would not be offensive to any Protestant. It is man-centered worship, stripped of all symbolism of the supernatural. The "Ordo Missæ" of amtipope Paul VI is an evil liturgical discipline, because (1) it contains a heretical definition of the Mass; (2) it was composed with the express purpose of making an ecumenical liturgy, pleasing to Protestants, stripped of Catholic truths concerning the priesthood, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist; (3) it was composed with the help and input of six Protestant ministers, which shows the heretical spirit in which it was conceived and formulated; (4) its authors systematically deleted from its prayers and lessons doctrines which would be offensive to heretics; (5) it teaches, both by its omissions and by its symbolism and gestures, heresies and errors concerning the priesthood, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

- What is wrong with the disciplines which have emanated from Vatican II?

- The "1983 Code of Canon Law" contains the heresy of Vatican II concerning the Church, mentioned above. It also permits sacrilege to the Blessed Sacrament, by approving of its reception by non-Catholics, which is a mortal sin, and permits "communicatio in sacris" with non-Catholics, which is a mortal sin. In addition, the Ecumenical Directory of 1993 permits ecumenical practices which have always

been taught by the Church to be mortally sinful.

- What does all this mean?

- It means that Vatican II and its subsequent reforms have given us a new religion, a religion which is substantially different from the Roman Catholic Faith founded by Jesus-Christ. The reformers have substantially altered the three main components of religion: doctrine, worship, and discipline. The result is that the reformers are promoting a religion of ecumenism in place of the Roman Catholic Religion, which has always taught that it alone is the one, true Faith, and that all other religions are false. The Vatican II religion teaches doctrines which have been condemned by the Church in the past. It has instituted rites and disciplines which are Protestant in nature. As a result, the religion which Catholics find in their local parishes and schools, although in name Catholic, is a new, non-Catholic religion already condemned by the Catholic Church.

- Could it be that you are merely giving a bad interpretation to Vatican II?

- No. The heretical nature of this council is confirmed by: (1) the doctrinal interpretation given to Vatican II by antipope Paul VI and his successors in their decrees, encyclicals, catechisms, etc.; (2) the series of abominations perpetrated by antipope John Paul II against the First Commandment of God, in the form of ecumenical ceremonies which constitute false worship, even to pagan deities in some cases; (3) the alteration of the Sacred Liturgy in such a way that the Catholic Mass has been replaced by a Protestant supper service; (4) the tampering with the matter and form of the sacraments so that many of them, but most notably the Holy Eucharist and Holy Orders, labor under doubt or invalidity; (5) the promulgation of disciplines, especially the "1983 Code of Canon Law" and the Ecumenical Directory, which approve of sacrilege against the Holy Eucharist and the Sacrament of Matrimony, and which demonstrate heresies concerning the unity of the Church as their theoretical basis; (6) the scandalous mockery made of the Sacrament of Matrimony by the granting of annulments for spurious reasons, constituting an abandonment of the sacred doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage; (6) Ratzinger's heretical pronouncements, both under antipope John Paul II and after "his own election" as antipope Benedict XVI, on the nature and unity of the Church.

- Why can they not be true Catholic Popes and true Catholic bishops?

- They cannot be true Catholic Popes because it is impossible that the authority of

the Roman Catholic Church, which is Christ's authority, give to the universal Church false doctrines, false liturgical practices, and false disciplines.

- Why cannot the authority of the Roman Catholic Church give to the universal Church false doctrines, false liturgical practices, and false disciplines?

- Precisely because it is the authority of Christ. The Pope is assisted by the Holy Ghost in the promulgation of dogma and morals, and in the enactment of liturgical laws and pastoral disciplines. In the same way that it is unimaginable that Christ could promulgate these errors or enact these sinful disciplines, so it is unimaginable that the assistance which He gives to the Church through the Holy Ghost could permit such things. Hence, the fact that the Vatican II "popes"have done these things is a certain sign that they do not have the authority of Christ. The teachings of Vatican II and the reforms which proceed from it are contrary to the Faith and ruinous of our eternal salvation. But since the Church is both indefectible and infallible, it cannot give to the faithful doctrines, laws, liturgy, and disciplines which are contrary to the Faith and ruinous of our eternal salvation. We must therefore conclude that this Council and these reforms do not proceed from the Church, that is, the Holy Ghost, but from an evil influence within the Church. From this it follows that those who have promulgated this evil Council and these evil reforms have not promulgated them with the authority of the Church, which is the authority of Christ. From this we rightfully conclude that their claim to have this authority is false, despite whatever appearance they may have, even despite an apparently valid election to the Papacy.

It is important to add that Pope Paul IV in 1559, fearful lest a Protestant be elected to the Papal throne, decreed (Constitution "Cum ex apostolatus") that if the person elected Pope should have deviated from the Catholic Faith or fallen into any heresy, his election shall be considered null, legally invalid, and void. He furthermore decreed that such a person must not be considered the Pope, even if he took possession of the office, was enthroned, and received the veneration and obedience of all the faithful.

Here ends the summary from Mgr Sanborn.

So, if Francis is the true Pope, every Catholic has a duty in conscience before God and His Catholic Church to obeying all Francis' decrees, according to the formal orders of Our Lord JESUS-CHRIST : Who listen to you, listen to Me, and who despises you, despises Me...; and who does not listen to the Church, let him by like the heathen and the publican, etc . This is NOT therefore a matter of opinion but a

matter of catholic Dogma, since by the authority of Holy Scripture and holy Apostolic Tradition, explained by the holy Catholic Church, Catholics are bound, obliged, to submit to the Roman Pontiff, for their eternal salvation:

“Furthermore, we declare, say, define, and proclaim to every human creature that they by necessity for salvation are entirely subject to the Roman Pontiff.” (H.H. Pope Boniface VIII, from the Bull “Unam Sanctam”, November 18, 1302)

But if Catholics obey Francis' official decrees and acts, as well as the official doctrines of Vatican II and its post-conciliar antipopes, they will fall into mortal sin, heresy and apostasy, denying Holy Scripture and holy Apostolic Tradition. But it is impossible, even greatly blasphemous and sacrilegious just to think about it, that Our Lord would push Catholics into false doctrines and thus to perdition. As a result, the only true solution is that Vatican II and its antipopes do not act for the Catholic Church of Our Lord JESUS-CHRIST, but for another modernist and satanic church, veiled with Christian piety, as the devil transforms himself into a angel of light (II Cor. 11, 14), in order to deceive and damn the souls. The modernists themselves name their church, the conciliar church. This consideration is merely theoretical, because it is practically IMPOSSIBLE that Francis, a rotary club member, i.e. a mason, a denier of Hell, a blasphemer and impostor who pretends that God is the author of non-catholic religions, an insulter and blasphemer of the Mother of God, a pachamama idol worshiper and profaner of saint Peter's Basilica, a promoter of immoral unions, a propagator of the satanic new world order, etc., etc., could possibly be the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church, Vicar of Our Lord and Saviour JESUS-CHRIST.

It is absurd, foolish and even treacherous for those liberal Catholics, who can see the moral ravages in Vatican and the dioceses, not to condemn the impostor antipope Francis and its satanic post-conciliar propaganda, with the false justification that, according to the laws of the Church, they pretend they lack the proper authority to judge. And as a result, these liberal Catholics will see the destruction of the dioceses infected by modernism and the souls walk towards Hell without lifting a finger to condemn the errors and their perpetrators. Actually, this is a matter of either cowardice or treason. It is the same pharisaic mentality, which through a false interpretation of the law condemned good works done on shabbat: And Our Lord rebuked it on different occasions. First, these liberal Catholics are in contradiction, because they accept Vatican II and its antipopes, but then they filter what to accept and what to refuse from their doctrines, a practice which in itself is contrary to the Catholic Faith:

“But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself. This obedience should, however, be perfect, because it is enjoined by faith itself, and has this in common with faith, that it cannot be given in shreds; nay, were it not absolute and perfect in every particular, it might wear the name of obedience, but its essence would disappear. Christian usage attaches such value to this perfection of obedience that it has been, and will ever be, accounted the distinguishing mark by which we are able to recognize Catholics. Admirably does the following passage from St. Thomas Aquinas set before us the right view: 'The formal object of faith is primary truth, as it is shown forth in the holy Scriptures, and in the teaching of the Church, which proceeds from the fountainhead of truth. It follows, therefore, that he who does not adhere, as to an infallible divine rule, to the teaching of the Church, which proceeds from the primary truth manifested in the holy Scriptures, possesses not the habit of faith; but matters of faith he holds otherwise than true faith. Now, it is evident that he who clings to the doctrines of the Church as to an infallible rule yields his assent to everything the Church teaches; but otherwise, if with reference to what the Church teaches he holds what he likes but does not hold what he does not like, he adheres not to the teaching of the Church as to an infallible rule, but to his own will.'(*Summa theologiae*, IIa-IIae, q. v, art. 3.)" (Cf. Pope Leo XIII, Encycl. “Sapientiae Christianae”)

On the other hand, God gave us His laws for our salvation and sanctification and not for our condemnation. Those who have studied canon law know well that, in particular situations, if the application of a law would cause harm rather than good, than this law would cease to oblige. Did the good thief, saint Dismas, have the authority to proclaim the divinity of Our Lord JESUS-CHRIST, while the religious authorities and almost the whole jewish nation with the Romans had condemn Him, through a false process? No, but he did it nevertheless, from the pulpit of his cross, and Our Lord the same day promised him Paradise. Did saint Veronica have the authority to approach our Lord, who was publicly “excommunicated” by the Synagogue? No, but she nevertheless offered help and compassion to Our Lord, Who in return recompensed her and the Church with the relic of the sacred veil. In this hour of trial for the Church and the world, we need much of such brave souls, to bring comfort to Our Lord and Our Lady, to help the Church and possibly, with God's grace, change the course of events. Without sacrifice nothing good will come out.

May Our Lady of Good Counsel protect us and guide us safely to the port of eternal salvation!